



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

or less Christian. It does not necessarily follow that private revenge is not Mosaic because it is unchristian. Legislative provisions which at one time are the most practical in effecting desired results may at another time be quite out of harmony or inadequate to the advanced condition of society. We greatly need to cultivate the *historic* view of Jewish history; it is only by this process that the Old Testament Scriptures can be vitalized and made to have an influence upon men.

The Inerrancy of the Original Autograph.* In the current discussion as to the quality and extensiveness of Biblical inspiration, the question has narrowed itself down to this: Was the original manuscript absolutely correct or not? It is admitted on all hands that there are errors in our current copies of Scripture, though the most radical of biblioclasts does not allege that any fundamental truth is affected by them. But the people are grasping the fact that the question touching the inerrancy of the original document is of such vital importance that it marks the divisional line between loyalty and disloyalty to the truth of God. It is quite sufficient for all practical purposes to know that the original copy of the Scriptures was thus flawless. The veracity of God is cleared in this manner, and the Scriptures are vindicated from the scandal that they merely "contain" his word. The Scriptures would not be *God's written* Word unless they were quite free from error [originally, is meant].

Truly there are many views of Biblical Inspiration, and the discussion concerning it which now abounds in the religious press, yes in the secular press as well, brings some quaint theories to the light. But it is a little surprising to find so eminent a minister as Dr. Burrell in the possession of such a theory as the above, and still more surprising to find it set forth in the columns of the *N. Y. Independent*. Could the *Independent* have really supposed that it was contributing, in the publication of the article, to the solution of this vexed problem? The agitation of the question is of the first importance. It is by such thorough discussion that truth is developed and formulated, and the church now demands a consistent, intelligent, Christian theory of Biblical Inspiration. Let every sincere effort be made, through every channel, to work out such a theory. But why should the attention be distracted by such an impossible view as Dr. Burrell holds? How does it help us, who have only errant copies of them, to hold that the originals were absolutely perfect? If inerrancy is the condition of infallibility, where is the infallible Bible for present use? How do we know what changes from the originals mar or vitiate the Scriptures now in our possession? If it was necessary that the original copies should be inerrant, and so God made them thus, why was it not equally necessary that they should be thus preserved for the Church? Surely it was not because God was not able for it, but what purpose had he in permitting the degeneration of his Word? As a matter of fact, do the Scriptures claim for themselves, even originally, to have been so absolutely perfect? Or, further, is it necessary to assume—for it can be nothing but sheer assumption—is it necessary to *assume* such absolute inerrancy in the original autographs in order to "clear God's veracity" and "vindicate the Scriptures from the scandal of merely 'containing' his word?" Is Dr. Burrell's theory of any service in this earnest search for truth? No. The avenue of approach to a true view of Biblical Inspiration runs in quite another direction, and at a higher altitude. The problem does not now call for *apriori* theories in God's defense, nor for dogmatism, nor for a spirit of strife; but for candid thought, a scholarly perspective, sincere and thorough investigation, and, permeating all, a spirit of dignity and sweet reasonableness.

Dr. Schurer on the Fourth Gospel.† I believe that the external evidence

* By David J. Burrell, D. D., in the *N. Y. Independent*, Sept. 24, 1891.

† By Prof. W. Sanday, D. D., in *Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1891, pps 529-544. Being a reply to the article entitled, "The Fourth Gospel," by Prof. Emil Schürer, D. D., in same magazine, Sept. 1891.